

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed on July 29, 2004, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12-18, 22, 27, 41-44, and 48-50 are amended. The applicant hereby respectfully requests that the patent application be reconsidered.

An item-by-item response to Examiner's objections or rejections is provided in the followings:

1. *Claim Objections*

The Examiner objects to claims 1, 8, 15-18, and 41-44 because of informalities of missing period after the numerals designating the claim.

In response to the objection, claims 1, 8, 15-18, and 41-44 are amended and the informalities are corrected.

2. *Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 103:*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikurak, US 6,671,818.

The Examiner states that even though that Mikurak lacks an explicit recitation of the after-sales-service-and-customer care center (ASCC) and "an electronic ASCC voucher", Mikurak implicitly shows same.

In response to the rejections, claims 1, 8, 15-18, and 41-44 are amended. The amended claims explicitly direct to the invention wherein the electronic vouchers are **issued to the customers**.

The amended claims are further differentiate and non-obvious over the disclosures made by Mikurak. Specifically, Mikurak's disclosures are systems and methods with database and communication systems to improve the supply chain operations and the electronic commerce from a supplier or vendor's perspectives. The good-and-service providers initiate, control and manage of the whole electronic commerce system and the operations to streamline and enhance

the whole cycle and of the supply chain transactions. The customers are passive and can only respond to the actions taken by the good-and-service providers. Since Mikurak looks from a perspective of the seller not buyer, in the supply chain system, the customers are objects of service while the sellers are taking all the efforts to improve their services. For that reasons, it is obvious for Mikurak to allocate and manage the network asset to streamline the supply chain system and it is NOT obvious for Mikurak to issue electronic vouchers due to the facts that Mikurak is trying to carry out "Problem isolation through translating and filtering events" purely from the position of a goods-and-service providers and NOT looking from the "events" from a customer's perspective.

In contrast, when the electronic vouchers are issued, the control and management of the after sales services and cares are transferred to the customers with well defined and quantified ASCC programs. Furthermore, the ASCC service providers can directly provide required service that may or may not be related to the original goods-and-service providers. For these reasons, the amended claims are not obvious over Mikurak.

For the above reasons, the amended claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12-18, 22, 27, 41-44, and 48-50 and the dependent claims are non-obvious in view of the cited prior art reference.

With the amended claims and the reasons provided above, the applicant hereby respectfully requests that Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 USC § 103 be withdrawn and the present application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
Bo-In Lin.

By



Bo-In Lin -- Attorney, Registration No. 33,948
13445 Mandoli Drive, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
(650) 949-0418 (Tel), (650) 949-4118 (Fax)